

**SECRET**

1 July 1964

**MEMORANDUM FOR:** Chief, Geographic Research

**SUBJECT:** Comments on IG Report of Survey


1. The final form of the IG report avoids specific conclusions and recommendations on D/GG. To this extent it is an improvement over the first draft. The report does not suffice, however, as either a description or an accounting of the Geographic Research Area.

2. The main weakness of the report is its distorted picture of the GRA research program. Mention is made of operations support and the Collation Project, and the report discusses at length two current projects related to operations support. This, however, is all; it hardly describes the GRA research program. The report ignores the fields of policy support, scientific-intelligence support, political-economic support, geodesy and gravimetry, and Antarctica. Considering that there is no reference, either, to the philosophy, problems, or goals of geographic research, the reader can have little idea of the actual scope and character of the activity.

3. I continue to be concerned at the report's distortion -- through the emphasis on it -- of the operations-support component of D/GG work. One loses sight of the fact that both the magnitude and the individual focus of operations-support projects, like others, change constantly. Over the long term, there has been an increase in DD/P use of geographic research, but this has not signified any lessening in policy support, for instance. As a service function, D/GG applies its efforts where the shoe binds the tightest, and our program changes frequently.

4. I continue to disagree with the report's assessment of the NIS, [redacted] programs. The author has not grasped the different purposes of these publications.

**SECRET**



SECRET

5. The report dwells at length on the erosion of ERA's research base, but has nothing to say about the problem of the GRA research base. Our problem is at least as troublesome, and has been with us longer. We have repeatedly recorded, since 1959, the erosion of the geographic intelligence research base and the inadequacy of our maintenance inputs. Coping with relentless overload and rapid enlargement of world areas on which quick responsiveness is needed constitutes, indeed, the main management task in D/GG and D/GC. We somehow failed to get this point over to the author of the report.

6. The report implies (as on p.2) that OPR may choose, or not, to continue policy support. I've always assumed that policy support is a mandatory function of the Office.

7. P. 4, para. 7. This is, of course, no program in support of NPIC. The report mistakes NPIC use of and role in the Collation Project. We do not expect the Collation Project "to terminate in the next few years."

8. P. 4, para. 7. The statement, "We have raised some question concerning the extent of certain types of support for the DD/P..." is confusing since the body of the report raises a query only about

9. P. 55, para. 10. With respect to "the problem of coordination with NPIC..." I am not aware that "solutions are actively being worked out." The only adequate solution -- establishment of a PI beachhead at Langley -- was recommended and dropped without action two years ago.

25X1C

25X1A

SECRET